

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

United States Department of Agriculture,

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

C. L. ALSBERG, Chief of Bureau.

SERVICE AND REGULATORY ANNOUNCEMENTS. SUPPLEMENT.

N. J. 6201-6250.

[Approved by the Acting-Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., April, 1919.]

NOTICES OF JUDGMENT UNDER THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT.

[Given pursuant to section 4 of the Food and Drugs Act.]

6201. Adulteration of tomato pulp. U. S. * * * v. 3,296 Cans * * * of Tomato Pulp. Case heard by the court. Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 8971. I. S. Nos. 1519-1521-p, 1523-1525-p. S. No. E-961.)

On December 27, 1917, the United States attorney for the Western District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 3,296 cans, each containing 5 gallons of tomato pulp, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Buffalo, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 14, 1917, by the Deblieux & Mays Co., Owensboro, Ky., and was being transported from the State of Kentucky into the Dominion of Canada, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and moldy vegetable substance and was unfit for food.

On February 1, 1918, William Davies & Co., Ltd., Toronto, Canada, claimant, having filed an answer denying that the goods were decayed and unfit for use as charged in the libel, and the case having come on to be heard, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal, and that judgment be entered against the claimant for the costs of the proceedings.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6202. Adulteration of evaporated milk. U. S. * * * v. 12 Cases of Evaporated Milk. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 8675. I. S. No. 16136-p. S. No. W-209.)

On December 29, 1917, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel of information praying the seizure and condemnation of 12 cases of evaporated milk, consigned on or about November 11, 1917, by Haas & Baruch, Wilmington, Cal., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped and transported from the State of California into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Mount Vernon Evaporated Milk, Mount Vernon Cream Company * * * Seattle, Washington."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel of information for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, putrid, and decomposed animal substance.

On February 4, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6203. Adulteration of fish. U. S. * * * v. 600 Kegs * * * of Fish. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 8689. I. S. Nos. 11734-p, 11735-p. S. No. C-783.)

On December 20, 1917, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 200 kegs, each containing 5 gallons of salted anchovies, and 400 kegs of salted sardines at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the articles had been shipped on November 3, 1917, by C. E. Van Lundingham Co., San Pedro, Cal., and transported from the State of California into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in the libel for the reason that they consisted in part of a decomposed animal substance, and for the further reason that they consisted in part of a filthy animal substance.

On March 26, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6204. Misbranding of Fernet-Universal. U. S. * * * v. August Petrucci (Venetian Distilling Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 8707. I. S. No. 11525-m.)

On April 4, 1918, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against August Petrucci, trading as the Venetian Distilling Co., St. Louis, Mo., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about November 13, 1916, from the State of Missouri into the State of Nebraska, of a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Fernet-Universal," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Solids (grams per 100 cc)-----	1.09
Sugars, direct as invert (gram per 100 cc)-----	.30
Nonsugar solids (gram per 100 cc)-----	.89
Ash (gram per 100 cc)-----	.02
Alcohol (per cent by volume)-----	38.2
Emodin: Indicated.	
Alkaloid (unidentified): Trace.	
Volatile oil: Trace.	
Caramel: Present.	

Tests for quinine, strychnine, and thujone: Negative.

The article is an alcoholic liquid containing small amounts of vegetable extractives and caramel.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained alcohol, and the label on the bottle failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained therein. It was further alleged, in substance, that the article was misbranded for the reason that certain statements appearing on the label falsely and fraudulently represented it as a febrifuge, a vermifuge, to be very efficacious for malarial fevers, to facilitate digestion, and as a cure for headache and stomach troubles if caused by impaired digestion, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On April 24, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and on May 17, 1918, the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6205. Adulteration and misbranding of tomatoes. U. S. * * * v. William F. Applegarth and Robert L. Simmons (William F. Applegarth). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$60. (F. & D. No. 8716. I. S. Nos. 2534-m, 1723-m.)

On May 10, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against William F. Applegarth and Robert L. Simmons, trading as William F. Applegarth, Golden Hill, Md., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about October 21, 1916, and November 13, 1916, from the State of Maryland into the State of New York, of quantities of articles labeled respectively in part, "Pride of Golden Hill Brand Tomatoes, packed by W. F. Applegarth, Golden Hill, Dorchester Co., Md.," and "Four-G Brand Tomatoes," which were adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department indicated the addition of water to the tomatoes in both cases. In the case of the product labeled, "Pride of Golden Hill Brand," the net weight was not stated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower or reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for tomatoes, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article in the shipment labeled, "Pride of Golden Hill Brand Tomatoes," was alleged for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On May 10, 1918, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$60.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6206. Adulteration of sardines. U. S. * * * v. 20 Cases of Sardines.
Consent decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.
(F. & D. No. 8726. I. S. No. 2857-p. S. No. E-965.)

On January 9, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 20 cases, each containing 100 cans of sardines, labeled in part, "Bouquet Brand American Sardines. Packed at Eastport, Washington Co., Me. L. D. Clark & Son," consigned on or about November 12, 1917, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Baltimore, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped by L. D. Clark & Son, Eastport, Me., and transported from the State of Maine into the State of Maryland, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed animal substance.

On April 29, 1918, the said L. D. Clark & Son, claimant, having appeared and admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6207. Adulteration and misbranding of evaporated milk. U. S. * * * v. 2,000 Cases of Evaporated Milk. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 8743. I. S. Nos. 1056-p, 1057-p. S. No. E-970.)

On January 22, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 2,000 cases, each containing 48 cans of evaporated milk, alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 24, 1917, by Garcia & Maggini Co., San Francisco, Cal., and transported from the State of California into the State of New Jersey, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a partially evaporated milk had been mixed and packed therewith, so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for the article purporting to be evaporated milk.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, "Evaporated Milk," borne on the label attached to the cans, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article contained therein was pure evaporated milk; and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was pure evaporated milk, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was a product other than pure evaporated milk, to wit, a product with which a partially evaporated milk had been mixed and packed. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the containers.

On March 12, 1918, the said Garcia & Maggini Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$11,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be relabeled under the supervision of this department.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6208. Adulteration of grapefruit. U. S. * * * v. 300 Boxes of Grapefruit. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Good portion sold. Unfit portion ordered destroyed. (F. & D. No. 8762. I. S. No. 16523-p. S. No. W-213.)

On or about January 19, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 300 boxes of grapefruit, consigned by H. C. Schrader Co., Homestead, Fla., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about January 4, 1918, and transported from the State of Florida into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it had been frozen, and the tissues thereof were undergoing rapid disintegration as a result of said freezing, and that it consisted in part of bitter, soft, mushy, and partly decomposed grapefruit.

On January 30, 1918, it appearing to the court that a portion of the product was not unfit for food, an order was entered directing the marshal to permit a representative of this department to assort the grapefruit and to sell through some reputable commission firm such of the fruit as was found fit for food and to return the adulterated and unfit portions thereof to the marshal. On March 19, 1918, the case having come on for final disposition, the action of the representative of this department in assorting and selling the grapefruit was approved and confirmed, and it was found by the court that the grapefruit held by the marshal was adulterated, and it was ordered that the same should be condemned, forfeited, and destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6209. Adulteration of oranges and tangerines. U. S. * * * v. 282 Boxes of Oranges and 85 Boxes of Tangerines. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Good portion sold. Unfit portion ordered destroyed. (F. & D. No. 8763. I. S. No. 16522-p. S. No. W-212.)

On or about January 19, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 282 boxes of oranges and 85 boxes of tangerines, consigned by H. C. Schrader Co., Orlando, Fla., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about December 31, 1917, from the State of Florida into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the articles was alleged in the libel for the reason that they had been frozen, and the tissues thereof were undergoing rapid disintegration as a result of said freezing, and consisted in part of bitter, soft, mushy, and partly decomposed fruit.

On March 19, 1918, the case having come on for final disposition, and in pursuance of an order of the court entered January 29, 1918, the portion of the product that was fit for food having been separated from that portion unfit for food and sold in pursuance of said order, and no claimant having appeared for the portion of the property that had been found unfit for food, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the oranges and tangerines found to have been unfit for food should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6210. Misbranding and alleged adulteration of oil meal. U. S. * * * v. Early & Daniel Co., a corporation. Tried to the court. Finding of not guilty upon first count charging adulteration. Finding of guilty upon second count charging misbranding. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 8464. I. S. No. 19631-m.)

On November 12, 1917, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Early & Daniel Co., a corporation, Cincinnati, Ohio, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about April 20, 1916, from the State of Ohio into the State of Indiana, of a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Tuxedo Old Process Oil Meal," which was misbranded and alleged to have been adulterated.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained over 20 per cent weed seeds, probably screening cake, and 29.9 per cent of protein.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, weed seeds or screenings, had been substituted in part for flaxseed product, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the following statement regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, appearing on the label, to wit, "The Early & Daniel Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio, Guarantees this Tuxedo Old Process Oil Meal to contain not less than * * * 32.0 per cent. of crude protein * * * and to be compounded from the following ingredients: Flaxseed Product," was false and misleading in that it represented that the article contained not less than 32 per cent of crude protein and consisted exclusively of flaxseed product; and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not less than 32 per cent of crude protein and consisted exclusively of flaxseed product, when, in truth and in fact, it did not contain 32 per cent of crude protein and did not consist exclusively of flaxseed product, but contained a less amount of crude protein, to wit, approximately 29.9 per cent of crude protein, and consisted in part of weed seeds or screenings. Thereafter the defendant company filed its motion to strike the information from the docket because not filed by leave of the court first had, which motion was overruled, as will more fully appear from the following opinion by the court (Hollister, D. J.):

The information was filed by the district attorney by virtue of his office without verification and without supporting affidavits. No warrant for arrest was sought.

The Circuit Court of Appeals in the Seventh Circuit affirmed the court below in holding such information to be good (*Abbott Bros. Co. v. United States*, 242 Fed. 751). Whether or not leave of the district court to file the information had been obtained in that case does not appear in the report.

The defendant's main reliance is on the decision by Judge Dillon in *United States v. Maxwell* (3 Dill. 275) who says:

(280) "We are of opinion, therefore, that offenses not capital or infamous may in the discretion of the court be prosecuted by information. We can not recognize the right of the district attorney to proceed on his own motion, and shall require probable cause of guilt to appear by the oath of some credible person before we will allow an information to be filed and a warrant of arrest to issue. But with these safeguards there is no more reason to fear an oppressive use of information than there is reason to fear an abuse of the powers of a grand jury."

The language must be restrained to the nature of the case before that court. The district attorney agrees that in cases in which a warrant of arrest is sought, leave of court must first be had before the information is filed. We can not say how far Judge Dillon's general remarks were influenced by the fact that a warrant of arrest was issued in that case.

It would not seem that *United States v. Smith* (40 Fed. 755) can be regarded as the law in view of all the authorities.

The most valuable case in this discussion, by reason of the care with which the opinion was written and the character of the judges who decided the case, is *Weeks v. United States* (216 Fed. 292), upon which *Abbott Bros. Co. v. United States* (242 Fed. 751) was based. Leave of court was first had before the information was filed. It was there said by Judge Rogers (297, 298):

"But there was no intention to limit the right of the Attorney General to prosecute by information, as he always had done. It was not necessary in England, either before or after the statute, that he should obtain leave of the court before filing his information, and there was therefore not the same reason why he should verify any information which he filed. Moreover, he was acting throughout under his oath of office, and it was not assumed that he would proceed upon information without probable cause."

Again, he says (302):

"If the application for the warrant is made to the court upon the strength of the information, then the information should be verified or supported by an affidavit showing probable cause to believe that the party against whom it is issued has committed the crime with which he is charged. But, if no warrant has issued, no arrest been made, and the person has voluntarily appeared, pleaded to the information, been tried, convicted, and fined, we fail to discover wherein any right secured to him by the fourth amendment has been infringed. The fact that in the case at bar the defendant demurred to the information because it was not verified and then pleaded not guilty only after his objection to the demurrer was overruled, does not affect the matter. There was nothing in the ruling of the court that deprived him of his constitutional right to have no warrant issued for his arrest, 'but upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmation.' No such warrant has been at any time issued, and no application for its issuance has ever been so much as requested."

If no constitutional right of the defendant is affected by an information filed by the district attorney, not supported by affidavit showing probable cause, except in cases in which a warrant for arrest is sought, the defendant can not have a constitutional right to require the district attorney to obtain leave of court before filing an information when no warrant of arrest is sought.

There is no statute on the subject, and the question becomes one of practice rather than one of right, and, as a matter of practice, it is now held, in accordance with the views of the judges in the second circuit in the case of *Weeks v. United States*, that in such a case as this, no leave of court is necessary before the information is filed.

It may be assumed that a United States district attorney will not file frivolous informations or of such character as to unnecessarily affect the good reputation of citizens whose business conduct he informs the court brings them within the operation of the food law.

Motion overruled.

On May 13, 1918, the case having come on for trial before the court, a jury having been waived, a finding of not guilty to the first count of the information, charging adulteration of the article, was made, and a finding of guilty to the second count, charging misbranding of the article, was made, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6211. Adulteration of grapefruit. U. S. * * * v. 342 Boxes * * * of Grapefruit. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 8535. I. S. No. 8235-p. S. No. C-748.)

On October 17, 1917, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 342 boxes of grapefruit, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped on October 5, 1917, by Dr. P. Phillips, Okeechobee, Fla., and transported from the State of Florida into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was colored in a manner whereby inferiority was concealed, and in that immature grapefruit had been substituted in part for mature grapefruit, which the article purported to be.

On October 19, 1917, John Denney, doing business as Denney & Co., Chicago, Ill., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product, after having been relabeled, "Colored by Sweating," should be released to said claimant, upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6212. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Fred Leclair. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 8549. I. S. Nos. 317-m, 508-m.)

On January 18, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Vermont, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Fred Leclair, Concord, Vt., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about July 14, 1916, and July 15, 1916, from the State of Vermont into the State of Massachusetts, of quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

	Shipment of July 14.			Shipment of July 15.			
Fat (per cent).....	3.40	2.90	2.40	3.30	2.90	3.30	3.60
Solids (per cent).....	10.41	10.11	9.18	10.76	10.08	10.31	10.89
Solids not fat (per cent).....	7.01	7.21	6.78	7.45	7.18	7.61	7.20

Product is deficient in solids and solids not fat, indicating added water.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower or reduce and injuriously affect its quality, and had been substituted in whole or in part for milk, which the article purported to be.

On May 15, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6213. Adulteration of grapefruit. U. S. * * * v. 457 Boxes of Grapefruit. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Good portion sold. Unfit portion ordered destroyed. (F. & D. No. 8791. I. S. No. 16524-p. S. No. W-214.)

On or about January 25, 1918, the United States attorney for the district of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 457 boxes of grapefruit, consigned by the H. C. Schrader Co., Homestead, Fla., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Colorado Springs, Colo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about January 6, 1918, and transported from the State of Florida into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it had been frozen, and the tissues thereof were undergoing rapid disintegration as a result of said freezing and consisted in part of bitter, soft, mushy, and partly decomposed grapefruit.

On January 30, 1918, it appearing to the court that a portion of the product was not unfit for food, an order was entered directing the marshal to permit a representative of this department to assort the grapefruit, and to sell through some reputable commission firm such of the fruit as was found fit for food, and to return the adulterated and unfit portions thereof to the marshal. On March 19, 1918, the case having come on for final disposition, the action of the representative of this department in the sorting and selling of the grapefruit was approved and confirmed, and it was found by the court that the grapefruit held by the marshal was adulterated, and it was ordered that the same should be condemned and forfeited, and destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6214. Misbranding of cottonseed meal or cake. U. S. * * * v. Hollis Cotton Oil, Light & Ice Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 8818. I. S. No. 19732-m.)

On April 1, 1918, the United States attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Hollis Cotton Oil, Light & Ice Co., a corporation, Hollis, Okla, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about December 14, 1916, from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Kansas, of a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Choice Cotton Seed Meal or Cake," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Fat (per cent)-----	5.46
Crude fiber (per cent)-----	14.7
Protein (N×6.25) (per cent)-----	36.2

The product contains less protein, less fat, and more crude fiber than declared on the label,

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, "Crude Protein not less than 41 per cent, Crude Fat not less than 6 per cent, Crude Fiber not more than 10½ per cent," borne on the label, regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein was false and misleading in that it represented that the article contained not less than 41 per cent of crude protein, not less than 6 per cent of crude fat, and not more than 10½ per cent of crude fiber; and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not less than 41 per cent of crude protein, not less than 6 per cent of crude fat, and not more than 10½ per cent of crude fiber, whereas, in truth and in fact, it contained less crude protein and crude fat and more crude fiber than was declared on the label, to wit, approximately 36 per cent of crude protein, 5.46 per cent of crude fat, and 14.7 per cent of crude fiber.

On May 6, 1918, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6215. Misbranding of W. H. Bull's Herbs and Iron Compound. U. S. * * *
v. W. H. Bull Medicine Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25
and costs. (F. & D. No. 8821. I. S. No. 11990-m.)

On May 2, 1918, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the W. H. Bull Medicine Co., a corporation, St. Louis, Mo., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about March 15, 1917, from the State of Missouri into the State of Tennessee, of a quantity of an article labeled in part, "W. H. Bull's Herbs and Iron Compound," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the preparation to be a weak alcoholic solution, containing iron, phosphates, sugar, and vegetable derivatives, among which are quinine, capsicum, gentian, and podophyllum.

It was alleged in substance in the information that the article was misbranded for the reason that certain statements appearing on the labels of the bottles and cartons falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a remedy for the relief of nervous disorders; to regulate and assist nature's processes in painful suppressed menses, cramps, spasms, and other irregularities that bring on pain and agony; to regulate liver and kidney force; to give volume to the blood, as a relief of nervousness, liver, kidney, and bladder diseases; as a remedy for the many distressing ailments peculiar to women; and for scrofula, rickets, and passive hemorrhages, when, in truth and in fact, it was not. It was further alleged in substance in the information that the article was misbranded for the reason that certain statements included in the circulars accompanying the article falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a remedy for weak nerves and to eliminate stomach and bowel disorders, and to remove womb trouble, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On May 6, 1918, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6216. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. * * * v. 427 Cases * * * of Shell Eggs. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Good portion ordered released on bond. Unfit portion ordered destroyed. (F. & D. No. 8833. I. S. No. 11829-p. S. No. C-810.)

On January 29, 1918, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 427 cases, each containing 30 dozen shell eggs, at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped on January 13, 1918, by Merring, Martin & Boise, Altus, Okla., and transported from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed animal substance, for the further reason that it consisted wholly of a decomposed animal substance, for the further reason that it consisted in part of a filthy animal substance, and for the further reason that it consisted wholly of a filthy animal substance.

On March 11, 1918, the said Merring, Martin & Boise, a copartnership, claimants, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, it having theretofore been ordered by the court that the product should be examined under the supervision of a representative of this department, and that the portion found unfit for human food should be destroyed, and that portion found fit for human food should be sold by a United States marshal; and it was further adjudged by the court that the net proceeds derived from the sale of the product should be turned over to said claimants.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6217. Adulteration of grapefruit. U. S. * * * v. 300 Boxes of Grapefruit.
Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.
(F. & D. No. 8842. I. S. No. 8429-p. S. No. C-826.)

On February 20, 1918, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 300 boxes of grapefruit, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about January 12, 1918, by the W. D. Horne Packing Co., Homestead, Fla., and transported from the State of Florida into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On May 13, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

621S. Adulteration and misbranding of tankage. U. S. * * * v. 480 Bags of Tankage. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 8843. I. S. No. 11832-p. S. No. C-831.)

On March 6, 1918, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 480 bags, each containing 125 pounds of tankage, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped on February 14, 1918, by the Chicago Feed & Fertilizer Co., Osborn, Ind., and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was represented to the purchaser to contain not less than 10 per cent of ammonia, whereas, in truth and in fact, a product containing less than 10 per cent of ammonia had been substituted in part for the article; and for the further reason that it contained an added deleterious ingredient, to wit, glass, which might render the article injurious to health.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the packages in terms of weight or measure.

On March 26, 1918, the said Chicago Feed & Fertilizer Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the article should be sold to be used for fertilizer.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6219. Adulteration of grapefruit. U. S. * * * v. 88 Boxes of Grapefruit. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Good portion ordered sold. Unfit portion ordered destroyed. (F. & D. No. 8854. I. S. No. 8927-p. S. No. C-820.)

On February 7, 1918, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 88 boxes of grapefruit labeled, "Lake Region Packing Association, Tavares, Fla.," remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about January 19, 1918, by the Florida Citrus Exchange, Tavares, Fla., and transported from the State of Florida into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, putrid vegetable substance.

On March 16, 1917, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the unfit portion should be destroyed and the good portion should be sold by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6220. Adulteration of tomato pulp. U. S. * * * v. 300 Cases of Tomato Pulp. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 8862. I. S. No. 16528-p. S. No. W-218.)

On March 18, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 300 cases of tomato pulp, consigned by the Wright Whittier Co., Ogden, Utah, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Denver, Colo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 16, 1917, and transported from the State of Utah into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed vegetable substance.

On April 17, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6221. Adulteration and misbranding of Effervescent Granulare. U. S. * * * v. Milano Pharmacal Co., Inc., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$15. (F. & D. No. 8882. I. S. No. 1602-p.)

On May 7, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Milano Pharmacal Co., Inc., a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on June 28, 1917, from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey, of a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Effervescent Granulare," and invoiced as "Eff. Magnesia," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Bicarbonate of soda (per cent)-----	13.7
Sucrose (per cent)-----	61.5
Invert sugar (per cent)-----	.8
Borax (per cent)-----	3.0
Cream of tartar (per cent)-----	17.8
Moisture (per cent)-----	3.5
Magnesia: None.	

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that an imitation product, to wit, a mixture composed in part of bicarbonate of soda, cream of tartar, sugar, and either borax or boric acid, had been substituted in whole or in part for effervescent magnesia, which the article purported to be; and for the further reason that it contained an added poisonous or deleterious ingredient, to wit, either borax or boric acid, which might render it injurious to health.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was a product, to wit, a mixture composed in part of bicarbonate of soda, cream of tartar, sugar, and either borax or boric acid, prepared in imitation of effervescent magnesia, and was offered for sale and sold under the name of another article, to wit, effervescent magnesia.

On May 15, 1918, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$15.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6222. Adulteration and misbranding of Dr. Bateman's Pectoral Drops.
U. S. * * * v. Pabst Pure Extract Co., a corporation. Plea of
guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 8888. I. S. No. 4783-m.)

On May 6, 1918, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Pabst Pure Extract Co., a corporation, doing business at Reading, Pa., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about May 4, 1917, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of West Virginia, of a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Dr. Bateman's Pectoral Drops," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that there was present only 27.8 per cent of the amount of alcohol declared on the label, while the morphine found was less than one-tenth of the declared amount.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the National Formulary, official at the time of investigation, and differed from the standard and [of] strength, quality, and purity, as determined by the test laid down in said National Formulary, official at the time of investigation, in that the article contained approximately $3\frac{1}{2}$ mls of tincture of opium in 1,000 mls of the article, and contained approximately 36.1 per cent of absolute alcohol, whereas the said National Formulary, official at the time of investigation, required the presence of 42 mls of tincture of opium in 1,000 mls of the article, and approximately 50 per cent of absolute alcohol.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, "Alcohol Contents, 50 per cent by volume. Opium 2 Grains, A Fl. Oz.," borne on the label, regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article contained not less than 50 per cent of alcohol by volume and not less than 2 grains of opium in each fluid ounce, whereas, in truth and in fact, it contained a less amount than 50 per cent of alcohol by volume and a less amount than 2 grains of opium in each fluid ounce. It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the further reason that certain statements appearing on the wrapper falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a remedy for all fluxes, spitting of blood, agues, measles, colds, coughs, and to put off the most violent fever; as a treatment, remedy, and cure for stone and gravel in the kidneys, bladder, and urethra, shortness of breath, straightness of the breast; and to rekindle the most natural heat in the bodies by which they restore the languishing to perfect health; whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On May 16, 1918, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and on May 17, 1918, the court imposed a fine of \$50.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**6223. Adulteration and misbranding of so-called saccharin. U. S. * * *
v. 100 Cans * * * of a Product Purporting to be Saccharin. De-
fault decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D.
No. 8905. I. S. No. 3922-p. S. No. E-1001.**

On March 27, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 100 cans, each containing 1 pound of a product purporting to be saccharin, consigned on or about February 12, 1918, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by D. Shor, Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity, as determined by the test laid down in said pharmacopœia, official at the time of the investigation, in that the strength and purity of the article, to wit, the said alleged saccharin, fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the name of, another article, to wit, saccharin.

On May 14, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6224. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. 10 Cases * * * of * * * Olive Oil. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 8907. I. S. No. 2684-p. S. No. E-1004.)

On March 27, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel of information praying the seizure and condemnation of 10 cases of olive oil, consigned on or about February 21, 1918, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by H. F. Zaloom & Co., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel of information for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of cottonseed oil, which had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance for the reason that the packages and the labels thereof bore a certain statement, to wit, "Olive Oil," which was false and misleading in that the product was not olive oil; and for the further reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, olive oil, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not; and for the further reason that by manner of display it led the purchaser to believe that the article was a foreign product, when, in truth and in fact, it was a product of domestic manufacture; and for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package in terms of weight, measure, and [or] numerical count.

On April 4, 1918, George B. Zaloom, claimant, New York, N. Y., having filed a satisfactory bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6225. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. * * * v. 55 Barrels of Vinegar. Heard by the court. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 8916. I. S. No. 11909-p. S. No. C-860.)

On April 1, 1918, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 55 barrels of vinegar, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Poplar Bluff, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about January 10, 1918, by R. M. Hughes & Co., Louisville, Ky., and transported from the State of Kentucky into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "R. M. Hughes & Co., Louisville, Ky., Distilled, Colored, Imitation Apple Vinegar, 80 grains."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in violation of section 7 and misbranded in violation of section 8 of the Food and Drugs Act.

On May 8, 1918, the case having come on for hearing upon the libel and the answer and claim of the said R. M. Hughes & Co., claimant, and the court having heard counsel for the parties, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6226. Adulteration of tomato puree. U. S. * * * v. 100 Cases of Tomato Puree. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 8991. I. S. No. 16540-p. S. No. W-222.)

On or about April 13, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 100 cases of tomato puree, consigned by the Wright Whittier Co., Ogden, Utah, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Trinidad, Colo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 29, 1917, and transported from the State of Utah into the State of Colorado, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Utah Fawn Brand Puree * * * packed by Wright Whittier Company, Ogden, Utah."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On May 16, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6227. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. 50 Cans of Alleged Olive Oil. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 9011. I. S. No. 12132-p. S. No. C-881.)

On April 29, 1918, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 50 cans of alleged olive oil, remaining unsold at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 7, 1918, by the Italian Products Distributing Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Pure Olive Oil * * * Imported Olio Puro d'Oлива * * * Extra Importato Sublime."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for olive oil.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement contained in the label, to wit, "olive oil," was false and misleading, and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, olive oil, and for the further reason that it purported to be a foreign product, when, in fact, it was the [a] product of domestic manufacture, packed in the United States of America.

On May 17, 1918, Lawrence Mercurio, doing business under the name of Mercurio & Co., St. Louis, Mo., claimant, having filed a claim and answer, admitting the material allegations in the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act,

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6228. Adulteration and misbranding of evaporated cream. U. S. * * * v. 17 Cases of Evaporated Cream. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 9018. I. S. No. 6453-p. S. No. E-1034.)

On April 30, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 17 cases, each containing 48 cans of evaporated cream, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at San Juan, P. R., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 17, 1918, by the Nestle's Food Co., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the island of Porto Rico, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Milk Maid Evaporated Cream."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that evaporated milk had been substituted for evaporated cream, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement "Evaporated Cream," was false and misleading, and deceived and misled the purchaser; and for the further reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, evaporated cream. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was mislabeled and misbranded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser in that the package, container, and label bore a statement regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein which was false and misleading; that is to say, the said label on the can was so arranged as to lead the public to believe that it contained evaporated cream, and the statements on the packages and containers were so arranged as to cause the purchaser thereof to believe that the article consisted of evaporated cream, whereas, in fact, it was not, but was evaporated milk.

On May 14, 1918, J. Ochoa y Hno., a partnership, San Juan, P. R., claimants, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to said claimants upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$250, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6229. Adulteration of ear corn. U. S. * * * v. 40,520 Pounds of Unhusked Ear Corn. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 384-c.)

On April 20, 1918, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 40,520 pounds of unhusked ear corn, remaining on board a railroad car at Canton, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 6, 1918, by Hugh Ledford, Tullahoma, Tenn., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On April 27, 1918, the said Hugh Ledford, claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6230. Misbranding of evaporated apples. U. S. * * * v. 390 Cases of Evaporated Apples. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 392-c.)

On March 21, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the chief food inspector of the State of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 300 cases, each containing 50 cartons of evaporated apples, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Macon, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 21 and 22, 1917, by W. H. Packard, Medina, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Georgia, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Choice Evaporated Apples Monogram Brand. * * * 8 oz. net weight."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was food in package form, and the contents of the packages were not stated correctly in terms of weight and measure on the outside thereof; that is to say, that each of said cartons was labeled, "8 oz. net weight," whereas, in truth and in fact, the actual weight of the contents of each of said cartons was 25 per cent less than the reputed weight of the cartons as shown by the label.

On December 9, 1918, Ouzts, Mitchell & Corbin, Macon, Ga., having filed a claim for the release of the product, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6231. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. * * * v. 500 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 330-c.)

On February 7, 1917, the United States attorney for the Western District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the dairy and food commissioner of the State of Virginia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 500 sacks of cottonseed meal at Front Royal, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about December 30, 1916, by W. Newton Smith, Baltimore, Md., and transported from the State of Georgia into the State of Virginia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article contained 33.75 per cent protein, a valuable constituent thereof, while it was guaranteed to contain 38.62 per cent protein, and was therefore adulterated in violation of section 7, and misbranded in violation of section 8 of the Food and Drugs Act.

On June 27, 1917, Luke Swift, trading as M. J. Swift & Co., claimant, having filed his petition for the property, and the cause having been submitted to the court, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and said claimant having executed a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, and the costs of the proceedings having been paid, it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6232. Adulteration and misbranding of wheat. U. S. * * * v. 33 Sacks of Wheat. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 345-c.)

In the month of March, 1916, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by a food and drug inspector for the State of Florida, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 33 sacks of wheat at Orlando, Fla., alleging that the article had been shipped by John Wade & Sons, Memphis, Tenn., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Florida, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that chaff, trash, and weed seeds had been mixed and packed with and substituted for the article labeled and branded, "Wheat 100 pounds gross."

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the gross weight and not the net weight of the contents of the sacks was marked on the outside thereof.

On May 16, 1916, the said John Wade & Sons, claimants, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimants upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6233. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. * * * v. 500 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 352-c.)

On November 8, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Maine, acting upon a report by the chief food and drug inspector, in charge of foods, drugs, and feeding stuffs, of Augusta, Me., filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 500 sacks of cottonseed meal, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Auburn, Me., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 3, 1917, and transported from the State of Georgia into the State of Maine, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Second Class Cotton Seed Meal."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded for the reason that the statement, borne on the sacks, regarding the ingredients or substances contained therein, to wit, "100 Pounds Second Class Cotton Seed Meal * * * Guaranteed Analysis Ammonia (actual and potential)—7.00 Per Cent (equal to protein 36.00 Per Cent) * * *," was false and misleading in that the sacks did not contain ammonia, actual and potential, of 7 per cent equal to protein 36 per cent, but contained an amount of protein materially less than 36 per cent; and for the further reason that said label or inscription was false in that the sacks did not contain 100 pounds of cottonseed meal, but contained an amount materially less than 100 pounds.

On November 30, 1917, the East St. Louis Cotton Oil Co., claimant, having filed a claim for the release of the product, it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6234. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. * * * v. 500 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 353-c.)

On November 23, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Maine, acting upon a report by the chief food and drug inspector, in charge of foods, drugs, and feeding stuffs, of Augusta, Me., filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 500 sacks of cottonseed meal, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Auburn, Me., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 21, 1917, and transported from the State of Georgia into the State of Maine, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Second Class Cotton Seed Meal."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded for the reason that the statement, borne on the sacks, regarding the ingredients or substances contained therein, to wit, "100 Pounds Second Class Cotton Seed Meal * * * Guaranteed Analysis Ammonia (actual and potential) -----7.00 Per Cent (equal to protein 36.00 per cent) * * *," was false and misleading in that the sacks did not contain ammonia, actual and potential of 7 per cent equal to protein 36 per cent, but contained an amount of protein materially less than 36 per cent; and for the further reason that said label or inscription was false in that the sacks did not contain 100 pounds of cottonseed meal, but contained an amount materially less than 100 pounds.

On November 30, 1917, the East St. Louis Cotton Oil Co., claimant, having filed a claim for the release of the product, it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6235. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. * * * v. 500 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 354-c.)

On December 1, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Maine, acting upon a report by the chief food and drug inspector, in charge of foods, drugs, and feeding stuffs, of Augusta, Me., filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 500 sacks of cottonseed meal, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Auburn, Me., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 25, 1917, and transported from the State of Georgia into the State of Maine, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Second Class Cotton Seed Meal."

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded for the reason that the statement borne on the sacks regarding the ingredients or substances contained therein, to wit, "100 Pounds Second Class Cotton Seed Meal * * * Guaranteed Analysis Ammonia (actual and potential) -----7.00 Per Cent (equal to protein 36.00 Per Cent) * * *," was false and misleading in that the sacks did not contain ammonia, actual and potential, of 7 per cent equal to protein 36 per cent, but contained an amount of protein materially less than 36 per cent; and for the further reason that said label or inscription was false in that the sacks did not contain 100 pounds of cottonseed meal, but contained an amount materially less than 100 pounds.

On December 8, 1917, the East St. Louis Cotton Oil Co., claimant, having filed a claim for the release of the product, it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6236. Adulteration and misbranding of East Coast Sweet Feed. U. S. * * * v. 343 Sacks of East Coast Sweet Feed. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 355-c.)

On October 27, 1917, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, acting upon a report by the commissioner of food, drug, and dairy feed stuffs, of Florida, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 343 sacks, each containing 90 pounds of East Coast Brand Sweet Feed, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Jacksonville, Fla., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about June 20, 1917, and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Florida, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance; and for the further reason that it was deficient in fat and nitrogen-free extract and contained an excessive amount of crude fiber.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the quantity of the contents of the sacks was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the packages in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count.

On November 23, 1917, the Consolidated Grocery Co., claimant, having filed a good and sufficient bond in conformity with section 10 of the act, it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to said claimant.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6237. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. * * * v. 200 Sacks * * * of So-Called Cottonseed Meal. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 361-c.)

On February 28, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the food and drug division of the State Board of Health of Kansas, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 200 sacks of cottonseed meal, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Dodge City, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 1, 1918, by C. M. Campbell & Co., Pine Bluff, Ark., and transported from the State of Arkansas into the State of Kansas, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the sacks did not contain any mark, brand, or label of any kind or character showing the net weight of the product, the composition of the contents thereof, or the food value of the same.

On March 21, 1918, the said C. M. Campbell & Co., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be correctly branded and labeled so as to show the true nature and amount of the product contained in the sacks.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6238. Adulteration and misbranding of walnuts. U. S. * * * v. 18 Sacks
* * * of Walnuts. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture,
and sale. (F. & D. No. 372-c.)

On December 20, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the secretary of the State Board of Health of Kansas, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 18 sacks, each containing 100 pounds of walnuts, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Topeka, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 10, 1917, by Frank P. Kruger, New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Kansas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed vegetable substance.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the sacks.

On March 11, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be sold by the United States marshal at public auction, and that the purchaser execute a bond in the sum of \$250, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be properly labeled.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6239. Misbranding of Eggette. U. S. * * * v. 100 Cartons and 1 Ten-Pound Paper Bag of So-Called Eggette. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 373-c.)

On December 20, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the secretary of the State Board of Health of Kansas, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 100 cartons, each containing 12 packages, and 1 ten-pound paper bag of Eggette, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Topeka, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about December 14, 1917, by the Bestever Products Co., Deering, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Kansas, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Eggette. Egg Substitute * * *."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it contained a larger per cent of cereal product, and that the label or brand was misleading and false and calculated to induce the purchaser to believe that the product was a substitute for eggs, and that each 10-cent package was equal in food value to 12 eggs, when, in truth and in fact, it contained a large per cent of cereal. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package in terms of weight.

On March 11, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be sold by the United States marshal, and that the purchaser execute a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be properly labeled.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6240. Misbranding of Eggette. U. S. * * * v. 60 Cartons of So-Called Eggette. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 374-c.)

On December 20, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the secretary of the State Board of Health of Kansas, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 60 cartons, each containing 12 packages of Eggette, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Topeka, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about December 7, 1917, by the Bestever Products Co., Deering, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Kansas, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Eggette. Egg Substitute * * *."

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it contained a large per cent of cereal product, and that the label or brand was misleading and false and calculated to induce the purchaser to believe that the product was a substitute for eggs and that each 10-cent package was equal in food value to 12 eggs, when, in truth and in fact, it contained a large per cent of cereal.

On March 11, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be sold by the United States marshal, and that the purchaser execute a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be properly labeled.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6241. Adulteration of hay. U. S. * * * v. One Carload of Hay. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Good portion ordered released. Unfit portion ordered destroyed. (F. & D. No. 375-c.)

On January 11, 1916, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the dairy and food commissioner of Virginia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of one carload of hay containing 22,810 pounds of hay remaining unloaded at Milford, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about December 24, 1915, by W. A. Bunting & Co., Jackson, Mich., and transported from the State of Michigan into the State of Virginia, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On April 15, 1916, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the good portion should be released in all ways from the force and effect of the judgment and monition as soon as the costs of the proceedings were paid, and that the unfit portion should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6242. Misbranding of cottonseed cake. U. S. * * * v. 400 Sacks of Cottonseed Cake. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 378-c.)

On February 28, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the food and drug department of the State Board of Health of Kansas, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 400 sacks of cottonseed cake, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Dodge City, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 1, 1918, by C. M. Campbell, Pine Bluff, Ark., and transported from the State of Arkansas into the State of Kansas, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the sacks did not contain any mark, brand, or label of any kind or character showing the net weight of the product or the composition of the contents thereof.

On March 21, 1918, C. L. Campbell, of Little Rock, Ark., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to the said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6243. Adulteration of unhusked ear corn. U. S. * * * v. 46,902 Pounds of Unhusked Ear Corn. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 380-c.)

On April 20, 1918, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the commissioner of agriculture of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 46,902 pounds of unhusked ear corn at White, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 23, 1918, by Hugh Ledford, Tullahoma, Tenn., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On June 10, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be sold at public auction by the United States marshal, after having given notice by verbal proclamation at the time of sale that the corn was adulterated in that it consisted in part of decomposed vegetable matter.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6244. Adulteration and misbranding of alfalfa hay. U. S. * * * v. 213 Bales of Green Alfalfa Hay. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 381-c.)

On April 15, 1918, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the commissioner of agriculture of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 213 bales of green alfalfa hay at Fish, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 25, 1918, by J. B. Horton & Co., Memphis, Tenn., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance; and for the further reason that a substance, to wit, animal excrement and decomposed alfalfa and vegetable substance other than green alfalfa hay, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, and lower, and injuriously affect its quality.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was offered for sale under the distinctive name of green alfalfa hay, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was a mixture of green alfalfa hay, animal excrement, and vegetable matter other than green alfalfa hay.

On June 10, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be sold by the United States marshal after having given notice, by verbal proclamation at the time of sale, that the hay was adulterated in that it contained filthy and decomposed vegetable matter.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6245. Adulteration of prunes. U. S. * * * v. 100 Boxes of Prunes. Heard by the court. Decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 457-c. I. S. No. 11276-r.)

On October 2, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Nebraska, acting upon a report by the State chemist of the State of Nebraska, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 100 boxes, each containing 50 pounds of prunes, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Lincoln, Nebr., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 21, 1918, and transported from the State of Iowa into the State of Nebraska, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal and vegetable substance.

On October 17, 1918, Raymond Bros. Clarke Co., Lincoln, Nebr., claimant, having filed an appearance and claim, after testimony was heard, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal, and that judgment be entered against said claimant for the costs of the proceedings.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6246. Adulteration and misbranding of oats. U. S. * * * v. 1 Carload of Oats. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 383-c.)

On April 26, 1918, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the dairy and food commissioner of Virginia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of one carload of oats, remaining unloaded at Richmond, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 8, 1918, by the Mueller & Young Grain Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Virginia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with certain foreign substances, to wit, barley, wheat, moldy corn, and more than 13 per cent of chaff and weed seeds, so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for oats.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under, the name of another article, to wit, oats.

On May 2, 1918, the said Mueller & Young Grain Co., claimant, having prayed for the release of the oats, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$2,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6247. Adulteration of corn. U. S. * * * v. 470 Sacks of Corn. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 385-c.)

On April 13, 1918, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the commissioner of agriculture of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 470 sacks of corn, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Sells, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 30, 1918, by the Town Creek Milling Co., Sweetwater, Tenn., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On April 23, 1918, the said Town Creek Milling Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be delivered to said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture*.

6248. Adulteration and misbranding of evaporated apples. U. S. * * * v. 185 Cases of Evaporated Apples. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 390-c.)

On May 2, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon a report of the chief pure food inspector of the State of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure of 185 cases, each containing 48 cartons of evaporated apples, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Vidalia, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on divers dates between December 10, 1917, and December 27, 1917, by the Wallerstein Produce Co., Richmond, Va., and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Piedmont Brand Evaporated Apples."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance, being in a moldy condition.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was in package form, and the contents of the packages were not stated correctly in terms of weight and measure on the outside thereof; that is to say, each of the cartons was labeled, "Net Weight 8 Ounces." whereas, in truth and in fact, the actual weight of the contents of each carton was 16 per cent less than the reputed and represented weight, indicated and shown by the labels.

On July 17, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6249. Adulteration and misbranding of evaporated apples. U. S. * * * v. 70 Cases of Evaporated Apples. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 391-c.)

On June 1, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon a report of the chief pure food inspector of the State of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 70 cases, each containing 48 cartons of evaporated apples, remaining unsold in the original, unbroken packages at Vidalia, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on November 1 and November 19, 1917, by the Wallerstein Produce Co., Richmond, Va., and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as Amended. The article was labeled in part, "Piedmont Brand Evaporated Apples."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a decomposed vegetable substance, being in a sour and moldy condition.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was in package form and the contents of the packages were not stated correctly in terms of weight and measure on the outside thereof; that is to say, each of the cartons was labeled, "Net Weight 8 Ounces," whereas, in truth, the actual weight of the contents of the packages was $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent less than the reputed and represented weight, indicated and shown by the labels.

On July 17, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6250. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. * * * v. 15 Barrels of Vinegar. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. Empty containers ordered sold. (F. & D. No. 393-c.)

On June 4, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the chief food inspector of the State of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 15 barrels, each containing 72 bottles of vinegar, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Cordele, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 9, 1918, by J. W. Oelerich & Son, Brooklyn, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Distilled Spirit Vinegar."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed with the article in such manner as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for vinegar, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Distilled Spirit Vinegar," borne on the label was false and misleading when applied to an article composed of a mixture of vinegar and water; and for the further reason that the bottles were labeled, "Contents One Pint," when, in fact, the average contents of said bottles was 7 per cent less than the quantity represented and reputed to be contained therein on said labels.

On October 12, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed, and that the empty containers should be sold by the United States marshal.

G. I. CHRISTIE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

1771

INDEX TO NOTICES OF JUDGMENT 6201 TO 6250.

**Cases containing decisions of the courts or instructions to juries.*

Alfalfa hay. <i>See</i> Hay.	N. J. No	Fish, anchovies:	N. J. No.
Anchovies. <i>See</i> Fish.		Van Lundingham, C. E., Co.	6203
Apples, evaporated:		sardines:	
Packard, W. H.-----	6230	Clark, L. D., & Son-----	6206
Wallerstein Produce Co. 6248, 6249		Van Lundingham, C. E., Co.	6203
Bateman's, Dr., pectoral drops:		Grapefruit:	
Pabst Pure Extract Co.-----	6222	Florida Citrus Exchange--	6219
Bitters, fernet-universal:		Horne, W. D., Packing Co.	6217
Venetion Distilling Co.-----	6204	Phillips, Dr. P.-----	6211
Bull's, W. H., herbs and iron com-		Schrader, H. C., Co.-----	6208, 6213
pound:		Hay:	
Bull, W. H., Medicine Co.-----	6215	Bunting, W. A., & Co.-----	6241
Compound, herbs and iron:		alfalfa:	
Bull, W. H., Medicine Co.-----	6215	Horton, J. B., & Co.-----	6244
Corn:		Herbs and iron compound. <i>See</i> Com-	
Town Creek Milling Co.-----	6247	pound.	
car:		Magnesia, effervescent:	
Ledford, Hugh.-----	6229, 6243	Meal. <i>See</i> Feed.	
Cottonseed cake. <i>See</i> Feed.		Milano Pharmacal Co.-----	6221
meal. <i>See</i> Feed.		Milk:	
Cream, evaporated:		Leclair, Fred.-----	6212
Nestle's Food Co.-----	6228	evaporated:	
Effervescente granulare:		Garcia & Maggini Co.-----	6207
Milano Pharmacal Co.-----	6221	Haas & Baruch.-----	6202
Effervescent magnesia. <i>See</i> Magnesia.		Nuts, walnuts:	
Eggette:		Kruger, Frank P.-----	6238
Bestever Products Co. 6239, 6240		Oats. <i>See</i> Feed.	
Eggs:		Oil meal. <i>See</i> Feed.	
Merring, Martin & Boise--	6216	Oil, olive:	
Evaporated apples. <i>See</i> Apples.		Italian Products Distribut-	
cream. <i>See</i> Cream.		ing Co.-----	6227
milk. <i>See</i> Milk.		Zaloom, H. F., & Co.-----	6224
Feed, cottonseed cake:		Olive oil. <i>See</i> Oil.	
Campbell, C. M.-----	6242	Oranges:	
Hollis Cotton Oil, Light &		Schrader, H. C., Co.-----	6209
Ice Co.-----	6214	Pectoral drops, Dr. Bateman's:	
cottonseed meal:		Pabst Pure Extract Co.-----	6222
Campbell, C. M., & Co.-----	6237	Prunes:	
East St. Louis Cotton Oil		Raymond Bros. Clarke Co.	6245
Co.-----	6233, 6234, 6235	Pulp. <i>See</i> Tomato pulp.	
Hollis Cotton Oil, Light &		Puree. <i>See</i> Tomato puree.	
Ice Co.-----	6214	Saccharin:	
Smith, W. Newton.-----	6231	Shor, D.-----	6223
oats:		Sardines. <i>See</i> Fish.	
Mueller & Young Grain Co.	6246	Sweet feed. <i>See</i> Feed.	
oil meal:		Tangerines:	
Early & Daniel Co.-----	*6210	Schrader, H. C., Co.-----	6209
tankage:		Tankage. <i>See</i> Feed.	
Chicago Feed & Fertilizer		Tomato pulp:	
Co.-----	6218	Deblieux & Mays Co.-----	6201
sweet:		Wright Whittier Co.-----	6220
Consolidated Grocery Co.-----	6236	puree:	
wheat:		Wright Whittier Co.-----	6226
Wade, John, & Sons.-----	6232	Tomatoes, canned:	
Fernet-universal. <i>See</i> Bitters.		Applegarth, William F.-----	6205
		Vinegar:	
		Hughes, R. M., & Co.-----	6225
		Oelerich, J. W., & Son.-----	6250
		Walnuts. <i>See</i> Nuts.	
		Wheat. <i>See</i> Feed.	

The history of the United States of America is a story of growth and development. It begins with the first settlers who came to the continent in search of a new life. They found a land of vast resources and opportunities, but also one of challenges and hardships. Over the years, the United States has grown from a small colony to a powerful nation, with a rich cultural heritage and a strong sense of identity. The story of the United States is a story of the American dream, of the pursuit of happiness and the promise of a better future for all.

The United States has a long and proud history, one that is filled with the achievements of its people. From the first settlers to the present day, the United States has been a land of innovation and progress. It has been a land where the impossible has become possible, where the dreams of its people have been realized. The United States is a land of hope and opportunity, a land where the future is bright and the possibilities are endless.

The history of the United States is a story of the American spirit, of the courage and determination of its people. It is a story of the struggles and triumphs of a nation that has overcome so many challenges and emerged as a global leader. The United States is a land of freedom and democracy, a land where the rights of its people are protected and their voices are heard. The United States is a land of peace and harmony, a land where the people of all backgrounds and beliefs can live together in unity and understanding.

The history of the United States is a story of the American people, of the men and women who have shaped the nation and its destiny. It is a story of the heroes and heroines of the American story, of the individuals who have made a difference in the world. The United States is a land of greatness and glory, a land where the best of humanity has flourished and the future has been made.

United States Department of Agriculture,

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

C. L. ALSBERG, Chief of Bureau.

SERVICE AND REGULATORY ANNOUNCEMENTS.

SUPPLEMENT.

N. J. 6251-6300.

[Approved by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., April 8, 1919.]

NOTICES OF JUDGMENT UNDER THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT.

[Given pursuant to section 4 of the Food and Drugs Act.]

6251. Adulteration of corn meal. U. S. * * * v. 150 Sacks, 300 Sacks, and 300 Sacks of Corn Meal. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 394-c.)

On April 22, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon a report of the chief pure food inspector of the State of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 150 sacks, each containing 96 pounds, 300 sacks, each containing 48 pounds, and 300 sacks, each containing 24 pounds, of corn meal, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Augusta, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 1, 1918, by the Fayetteville Milling Co., Fayetteville, Tenn., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On July 10, 1918, Morris-Bell-McAuliffe Co., Augusta, Ga., claimants, having filed a claim for the article, it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimants upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be labeled, "Damaged corn meal, fit for hog feed only."

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6252. Adulteration of ear corn. U. S. * * * v. 1 Carload of Bulk Ear Corn. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 395-c.)

On March 21, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon a report of the chief pure food inspector of the State of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 1 carload of ear corn, remaining unsold at Milledgeville, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 18, 1918 by the Prater-Mottier Co., Terre Haute, Ind., and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in large part, to wit, about 90 per cent of the whole, of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On May 15, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that, as the product was of a perishable character and rapidly deteriorating in quality, it should be sold by the United States marshal at public auction as damaged corn, fit for hog feed only.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6253. Adulteration of ear corn. U. S. * * * v. 1 Carload of Bulk Ear Corn. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 396-c.)

On April 15, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon a report of the chief pure food inspector of the State of Georgia, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 1 carload of ear corn, remaining unsold, at Milledgeville, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 22, 1918, by the Elwood Grain Co., St. Joseph, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it consisted in large part, to wit, about 90 per cent of the whole, of a decomposed vegetable substance.

On May 15, 1918, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that, as the product was of a perishable character and rapidly deteriorating in quality, it should be sold by the United States marshal at public auction as damaged corn, fit for hog feed only.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6254. Adulteration of bacon. U. S. * * * v. Meyer Edlavitch. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 398-c.)

On November 22, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Meyer Edlavitch, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale on October 4, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of bacon which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of filthy and decomposed animal and vegetable substance.

On November 22, 1917, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6255. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. John Richter. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 399-c.)

On December 13, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against John Richter, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on November (?) 24, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On December 13, 1917, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6256. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Michael A. Mahoney. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 490-c.)

On December 31, 1917, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Michael A. Mahoney, Mitchell, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 15, 1917, and November 23, 1917, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had been wholly and in part abstracted and removed therefrom.

On December 31, 1917, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6257. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Elizabeth Nash. Collateral of \$20 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 401-c.)

On January 9, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Elizabeth Nash, Alexandria, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on December 10, 1917, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On January 9, 1918, the case having been called and the defendant having failed to appear, the \$20 that had been deposited by her as collateral to insure her appearance was forfeited by the court.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6258. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Mary E. Ogle. Plea of guilty.
Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 402-c.)

On January 16, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Mary E. Ogle, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on December(?) 20, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On January 16, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6259. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. James A. Priutt. Collateral of \$15 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 403-c.)

On February 15, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against James A. Priutt, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell on January 30, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had been abstracted in whole or in part.

On February 15, 1918, the case having been called and the defendant having failed to appear, the \$15 that had been deposited by him as collateral to insure his appearance was forfeited by the court.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6260. Adulteration of cream. U. S. * * * v. W. Clements Jester. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 404-c.)

On February 20, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against W. Clements Jester, Alexandria, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on January 17, 1918, and February 4, 1918, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of quantities of cream which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained less than 20 per cent of butter fat.

On February 20, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6261. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. George M. Kephart. Collateral of \$15 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 405-c.)

On February 28, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against George M. Kephart, Gaithersburg, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 14, 1917, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On February 28, 1918, the case having been called and the defendant having failed to appear, the \$15 that had been deposited by him as collateral to insure his appearance was forfeited by the court.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6262. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. John T. Hurst. Plea of guilty to count 2 of the information. Fine, \$10. Count 1 nolle prossed. (F. & D. No. 406-c.)

On March 9, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against John T. Hurst, Vienna, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about February 7, 1918, and February 13, 1918, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 9, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to count 2 of the information, charging adulteration of the article in the shipment on February 13, 1918, and the court imposed a fine of \$10. Count 1 of the information, charging adulteration of the article in the shipment of February 7, 1918, was nolle prossed.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6263. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. Charles Colvin (Charles Colvin & Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 407-c.)

On March 14, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Charles Colvin, trading as Charles Colvin & Co., Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on October 12, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of oysters which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been added so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On March 14, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6264. Adulteration of butter. U. S. * * * v. George B. Bryan. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 408-c.)

On March 14, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against George B. Bryan, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on November 23, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of butter which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, oleomargarine, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 14, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6265. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. Albert Fuss. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 409-c.)

On March 14, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Albert Fuss, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on November 23, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of oysters which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been added, so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On March 14, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6236. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. John Sheehan. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 410-c.)

On March 14, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against John Sheehan, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on November 19, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of oysters which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been added so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On March 14, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6267. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Frank J. Weaver. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$15. (F. & D. No. 411-c.)

On March 15, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Frank J. Weaver, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on January 30, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had in part been abstracted, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 15, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$15.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6268. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Adolph H. Cordes. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 412-c.)

On March 16, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Adolph H. Cordes, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on January 30, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had in part been abstracted, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 16, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6269. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Albert Price. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 413-c.)

On March 18, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Albert Price, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on January 30, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had in part been abstracted, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 18, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6270. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Peter Borrás & Co., a corporation. Plea of *nolo contendere*. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 414-c.)

On March 18, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Peter Borrás & Co., a corporation, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant company, on January 30, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had in part been abstracted, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 18, 1918, the defendant company entered a plea of *nolo contendere* to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6271. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. William S. Hatton. Collateral of \$20 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 415-c.)

On March 18, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against William S. Hatton, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on October 26, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of oysters which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been added so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On March 18, 1918, the case having been called and the defendant having failed to appear, the \$20 that had been deposited by him as collateral to insure his appearance was forfeited by order of the court.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6272. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. Enoch Barnes. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 416-c.)

On March 19, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Enoch Barnes, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on November 14, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of oysters which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been added, so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On March 19, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6273. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. Newton A. Malone. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 417-c.)

On March 19, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Newton A. Malone, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on November 14, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of oysters which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been added, so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On March 19, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6274. Adulteration of ground sausage meat. U. S. * * * v. John Browman. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 418-c.)

On March 19, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against John Browman, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on October 20, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of ground sausage meat which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy and decomposed animal and vegetable substance, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 19, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE QUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6275. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Jacob C. Snyder. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 419-c.)

On March 19, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Jacob C. Snyder, Germantown, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on December 15, 1917, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 19, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6276. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Louis Mandes. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (T. & D. No. 420-c.)

On March 21, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Louis Mandes, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on January 30, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had in part been abstracted, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 21, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6277. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Nannie Huntley. Plea of guilty. Personal bonds taken. (F. & D. No. 421-c.)

On March 23, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Nannie Huntley, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant did offer for sale and sell, on January 30, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had in part been abstracted, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 23, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court ordered that the personal bond of the defendant be taken,

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6278. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Angelo Grechis. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 422-c.)

On March 25, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Angelo Grechis, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on January 30, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act did offer for sale and sell a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had in part been abstracted, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On March 25, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6279. Adulteration of black-eyed peas. U. S. * * * v. Old Dutch Market, Inc. Collateral of \$20 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 423-c.)

On April 16, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against the Old Dutch Market, Inc., doing business at Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on November 28, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act did offer for sale and sell a quantity of black-eyed peas which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy and decomposed animal or vegetable substance.

On April 16, 1918, the case having been called and the defendant having failed to appear, the \$20 that had been deposited by it as collateral to insure its appearance was forfeited by order of the court.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6280. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Charles A. Walter. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 424-c.)

On April 20, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Charles A. Walter, Doubs, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on March 4, 1918, and April 6, 1918, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On April 20, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6281. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. William H. Martin. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 425-c.)

On April 22, 1918, the United State attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against William H. Martin, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on March 5, 1918 and April 4, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell quantities of oysters which were adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been added thereto so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On April 22, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6282. Adulteration of lard. U. S. * * * v. Henry Clark. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 426-c.)

On April 27, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Henry Clark, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on March 7, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of lard which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil and beef stearin, had been substituted in part for the article, so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On April 27, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6283. Adulteration of lard. U. S. * * * v. Charles Sislen. Plea of guilty.
Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 427-c.)

On April 29, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Charles Sislen, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on March 12, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of lard which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, beef stearin, had been substituted in part for the article so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On April 29, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6284. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Albert F. Meen. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 428-c.)

On May 3, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Albert F. Meen, Gaithersburg, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on March 18, 1918, and March 25, 1918, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On May 3, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6255. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Frederick A. Löffler. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 429-c.)

On May 10, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Frederick A. Löffler, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on March 29, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been added thereto, so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On May 10, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture*.

6286. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Omeio Wells. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 430-c.)

On May 27, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Omeio Wells, Wellington, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on April 23, 1918, April 27, 1918, and May 24, 1918, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On May 27, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6287. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Selma M. Mason. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 431-c.)

On June 1, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Selma M. Mason, Gainesville, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on March 26, 1918, and March 29, 1918, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had in part been abstracted, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On June 1, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**6288. Adulteration of hamburger steak. U. S. * * * v. George E. Miller.
Collateral of \$20 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 432-c.)**

On June 7, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of the said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against George E. Miller, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on May 1, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of hamburger steak which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal and vegetable substance which rendered it unfit for consumption as food.

On June 7, 1918, the case having been called and the defendant having failed to appear, the \$20 that had been deposited by him as collateral to insure his appearance was forfeited by order of the court.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6289. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. David Johnson. Collateral of \$50 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 433-c.)

On June 20, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against David Johnson, Bladensburg, Md., alleging that said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on April 29, 1918, at the District aforesaid, did offer for sale and sell, and on May 16, 1918, did offer for sale and sell, and did introduce into said District, quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On June 20, 1918, the case having been called and the defendant having failed to appear, the \$50 that had been deposited by him as collateral to insure his appearance was forfeited by order of the court.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6280. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Charles A. Roussos. Collateral of \$25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 434-c.)

On June 14, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Charles A. Roussos, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on June 1, 1918, at the District aforesaid in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained an added injurious constituent, to wit, dirt.

On June 14, 1918, the case having been called and the defendant having failed to appear, the \$25 that had been deposited by him as collateral to insure his appearance, was forfeited by order of the court.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6291. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Washington B. Chichester. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 435-c.)

On June 24, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Washington B. Chichester, Olney, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on April 17, 1918, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On June 24, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

G292. Adulteration of oysters. U. S. * * * v. John L. Howe. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 436-c.)

On November 21, 1917 the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against John L. Howe, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on October 26, 1917, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of oysters which were adulterated. }

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water had been added thereto so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On November 21, 1917, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6293. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. William Cashell. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 437c.)

On January 3, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against William Cashell, Silver Spring, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 29, 1917, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District, of a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On January 3, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6294. Misbranding of macaroni. U. S. * * * v. A. F. Ghiglione & Sons, a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 7567. I. S. No. 20904-1.)

On September 23, 1918, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against A. F. Ghiglione & Sons, a corporation, Seattle, Wash., alleging the shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about March 21, 1916, from the State of Washington into the State of Oregon, of a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Gragnano Macaroni Brand Italian Macaroni," which was misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Gragnano Macaroni Brand Italian Macaroni Manufacturers, Qualita Insuperabile. Prepared for exportation," regarding the article, with a certain pictorial design representing an Italian scene, and the general style of the package were false and misleading in that they indicated that the article was a foreign product, to wit, a macaroni produced in the Kingdom of Italy; and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was a foreign product, to wit, a macaroni produced in the kingdom of Italy, when, in truth and in fact, it was not a foreign product, to wit, a macaroni produced in the kingdom of Italy, but was a domestic product, to wit, a macaroni produced in the United States of America; and for the further reason that the label and pictorial design, together with the general style of the package, purported the article to be a foreign product, to wit, a macaroni produced in the kingdom of Italy, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not a foreign product, to wit, a macaroni produced in the kingdom of Italy, but was a domestic product, to wit, a macaroni produced in the United States of America.

On November 25, 1918, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6295. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. J. H. Ledger. Plea of guilty.
Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 439-c.)

On April 26, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against J. H. Ledger, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on April 15, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butter fat, had been abstracted in part, so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On April 26, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6296. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Clifford L. Thomas. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 440-c.)

On April 27, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Clifford L. Thomas, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on February 25, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been added, so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On April 27, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6297. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Fremont Pennoyer. Collateral of \$25 forfeited. (F. & D. No. 441-c.)

On May 4, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Fremont Pennoyer, Culpeper, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on April 13, 1918, April 16, 1918, and April 19, 1918, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, and the introduction into said District of quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On May 4, 1918, the case having been called and the defendant having failed to appear, the \$25 that had been deposited by him as collateral to insure his appearance was forfeited by order of the court.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6298. Adulteration of lard. U. S. * * * v. Christopher Rammling. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 442-c.)

On April 29, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Christopher Rammling, Washington D. C., alleging that said defendant, on March 12, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of lard which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, beef stearin, had been substituted in part for the article so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On April 29, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6299. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. Andrew Dracos. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 443-c.)

On May 14, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Andrew Dracos, Washington, D. C., alleging that said defendant, on April 17, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality.

On May 14, 1918, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

CLARENCE OUSLEY *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6300. Adulteration of ginger ale. U. S. * * * v. Samuel C. Palmer & Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. No. 447-c.)

On July 9, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, filed in the police court of the District aforesaid an information against Samuel C. Palmer Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., alleging that said company, on June 3, 1918, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, did offer for sale and sell a quantity of ginger ale which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained added poisonous and deleterious ingredients, to wit, flies and filth, which rendered the article of food injurious to health.

On July 9, 1918, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

CLARENCE OUSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

INDEX TO NOTICES OF JUDGMENT 6251 TO 6300.

Bacon :	N. J. No.	Milk—Continued.	N. J. No.
Edlavitch, Meyer-----	6254	Loffler, Frederick A-----	6285
Butter :		Mahoney, Michael A-----	6256
Bryan, George B-----	6264	Mandes, Louis-----	6276
Corn, ear :		Mason, Selma M-----	6287
Elwood Grain Co-----	6253	Meen, Albert F-----	6284
Prater-Mottier Co-----	6252	Nash, Elizabeth-----	6257
Corn meal. <i>See</i> Feed.		Ogle, Mary E-----	6258
Cream :		Pennoyer, Fremont-----	6297
Jester, W. Clements-----	6260	Price, Albert-----	6269
Ear corn. <i>See</i> Corn.		Priutt, James A-----	6259
Feed, corn meal :		Richter, John-----	6255
Fayetteville Milling Co-----	6251	Roussos, Charles A-----	6290
Ginger ale :		Snyder, Jacob C-----	6275
Palmer, Samuel C., Co-----	6300	Thomas, Clifford L-----	6296
Hamburger steak. <i>See</i> Steak.		Walter, Charles A-----	6280
Lard :		Weaver, Frank J-----	6267
Clark, Henry-----	6282	Wells, Omeio-----	6286
Rammling, Christopher-----	6298	Oysters :	
Sislen, Charles-----	6283	Barnes, Enoch-----	6272
Macaroni :		Colvin, Charles, & Co-----	6263
Ghiglione, A. F., & Sons--	6294	Fuss, Albert-----	6265
Milk :		Hatton, William S-----	6271
Borras, Peter, & Co-----	6270	Howe, John L-----	6292
Cashell, William-----	6293	Malone, Newton A-----	6273
Chichester, W. B-----	6291	Martin, William H-----	6281
Cordes, Adolph H-----	6268	Sheehan, John-----	6266
Dracos, Andrew-----	6299	Peas, black-eyed :	
Grechis, Angelo-----	6278	Oid Dutch Market-----	6279
Huntley, Nannie-----	6277	Sausage meat, ground :	
Hurst, John T-----	6262	Browman, John-----	6274
Johnson, David-----	6289	Steak, hamburger :	
Kephart, George M-----	6261	Miller, George E-----	6288
Ledger, J. H-----	6295		

